

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

In the non-final Office action dated February 1, 2011, claims 1-33 and 35-37 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 35, and 37 are independent. Claim 34 was previously canceled. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 22, 27, 28, 33, 35, and 37 stand rejected. The Office allows claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 13, 16-18, 20, 21, 23-26, 29-32, and 36 if rewritten in independent form. The previously allowed claims 22, 35, and 37 are withdrawn in view of a 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection.

Several claims have been amended to address informalities and to provide further clarification of the claims. Support for the amendment of claim 22 is found at least at page 4, lines 27-28 of the specification as originally filed. No new subject matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claims 26, 30, and 31 are objected to because of informalities. The Office action suggests inserting the phrase “information element” between “reservation” and “IE.”

In accordance with the suggestion in the Office action, Applicants hereby insert the phrase “information element” between “reservation” and “IE” in claims 26, 30, and 31. As such, the objections of claims 26, 30, and 31 should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 22, 35, and 37 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Applicants amend claims 22, 35, and 37 to provide further clarity. Accordingly, claims 22, 35, and 37 are allowable and the 112 rejection should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 27, 28, and 33 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,665,311 to Kondylis et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Kondylis”). Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the following reasons, Kondylis does not anticipate claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 27, 28, and 33.

Applicants' claim 1 is an independent claim that serves as an independent base claim for dependent claims 3-5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 27, 28, and 33. Claim 1 recites:

A method of decentralized medium access control in a communications network including a plurality of devices, comprising:

dividing time into a sequence of at least one superframe; and

a first device of said plurality of devices transmitting in the superframe at a target beacon transmission time (TBTT) a beacon frame that includes a reservation for a planned transmission by a sender device during the superframe.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Office Action alleges that Kondylis at figs. 9 and 10; col. 16, line 62 – col. 17, line 5; col. 17, lines 21-29, 29-33, 45-53, and 61-66 discloses “a beacon frame that includes a reservation for a planned transmission.” Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Kondylis apparently relates to adaptive reservation in wireless ad-hoc networks. (Title.). The cited portions of Kondylis seem to disclose a frame 900 is divided into a signaling subframe 902 and a data subframe 904 in which the signaling subframe 902 comprises a plurality of reservation slots 906.

However, in contrast to claim 1, Kondylis does not disclose a beacon frame that includes a reservation for a planned transmission by a sender device during the superframe.

Kondylis teaches a unicast frame structure for a half-duplex time division multiple access (TDMA) technique. (Col. 6, lines 13-15.). The unicast frame structure as depicted in fig. 3 shows the signaling subsection 302 comprises a plurality of minislots triplets 306, wherein each of the minislots triplets apparently includes a request to send (RTS) minislots 308, a (not) clear to send ((N)CTS) minislots 310, and a confirmation (CONF) minislots 312. (Col. 7, lines 49-55.).

Although Kondylis discloses a signaling subsection which comprises minislots triplets which includes RTS, (N)CTS, and CONF minislots, the signaling subsection of Kondylis' unicast frame structure for a half-duplex TDMA technique does not include a slot for a beacon. Therefore, Kondylis' signaling subsection is not the same as, nor equivalent to, a

beacon frame that includes a reservation for a planned transmission by a sender device during the superframe as set forth in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Kondylis and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 3-5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 27, 28, and 33 ultimately depend from and incorporate all the features of allowable claim 1. Furthermore, each dependent claim includes additional distinguishing features. For each dependent claim, Applicants apply the above arguments from claim 1 to each respective dependent claim. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 3-5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 27, 28, and 33 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable parent claim and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection to claims 3-5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 27, 28, and 33 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Conclusion

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance.

If there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Brian S. Myers/
Brian S. Myers
Registration No.: 46,947
973-401-7157